DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 297 171 CE 050 692

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Measuring Up. Planning and Managing with Performance Standards--PY (Program Year) 88. |
| INSTITUTION | National Alliance of Business, Inc., Washington, D.C. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. |
| REPORT NO | ISBN-0-88713-604-4 |
| PUB DATE | 86 |
| NOTE | 65p.; Original version was written by the Employment and Training Institute, Inc. and funded by the New Jersey Department of Labor. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | National Alliance of Business Clearinghouse, 1015 15th Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005 (Related software package--$399.00; annual updates--$50.00). |
| PUB TYPE | Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Adult Education; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Job Training; Performance; *Performance Factors; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Specifications; *Standards |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Job Training Partnership Act 1982 |

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this guide is to provide local policymakers and program managers with an approach for using performance standards as a tool for reviewing and improving performance in Job Training Partnership Act programs at the local level. The guide is keyed to the Department of Labor adjustment methodology for activities beginning July 1, 1988. Section I discusses the evolution of performance standards and their supporting rationale. Section II details a systematic approach to obtaining comprehensive baseline data on local performance, an analysis of the performance of specific activities and contractors within the service delivery area (SDA), an analysis of performance trends, and a comparison with other SDAs. Section III describes two approaches for improving performance: the Oversight Response, which identifies probable causes of poor performance, and the Planning Response, which provides tools to examine new strategies and approaches that will improve performance. Section IV summarizes the key issues related to planning and managing with performance standards. Sample reports, charts, and worksheets are provided as needed. Many of the reports and worksheets in the guide require routine, yet time-consuming, computations using local participant and financial data. A software option (not available here) is available for microcomputer users to speed up the analysis. (YLB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

N Sipek

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED297171

National Alliance of Business

# Measuring-up

## planning and managing with performance standards

CE050693

# Measuring Up

## Planning and Managing With Performance Standards - PY 88

Activities of the National Alliance of Business are financed with both public and private resources. The largest share of public funding comes in a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor. Opinions reflected in this publication do not necessarily reflect official Labor Department policy.

Copies of this guide may be obtained by writing or calling the NAB Clearinghouse,
1015 15th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20005
202/289-2910

Copyright © 1986 by the National Alliance of Business. All rights reserved.
TRN/068/1.5
TRN/056/2
TRN/126/1
ISBN 0-88713-604-4

## Table of Contents


| | Page |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Section I: Overview of Performance Standards | 4 |
| Section II: Identification of Local Performance | 10 |
| Calculating Current Performance | 10 |
| Baseline Program Review | 11 |
| Trend and Comparison Analysis | 19 |
| Section III: Strategies for Improving Performance | 27 |
| Oversight Response | 27 |
| Planning Response | 37 |
| Section IV: Conclusion | 47 |


### Summary of Reports/Charts/Worksheets


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Worksheet 1: | Performance Status Report | 12 |
| Worksheet 2: | Performance Status Graph | 13 |
| Worksheet 3: | Analysis of Enrollments and Expenditures | 14 |
| Worksheet 4: | Performance of Terminees by Characteristic – Adult | 15 |
| Worksheet 5: | Performance of Terminees by Characteristic – Youth | 16 |
| Worksheet 6: | Analysis of Programs/Contractors – Adult | 17 |
| Worksheet 7: | Analysis of Programs/Contractors – Youth | 18 |
| Worksheet 8: | Adult Trend Analysis | 22 |
| Worksheet 9: | Youth Trend Analysis | 23 |
| Worksheet 10: | Follow-up Trend Analysis | 24 |
| Worksheet 11: | Trend Analysis By Standard | 25 |
| Worksheet 12: | Comparison Analysis | 26 |
| Oversight Response Summary | | 30 |
| Systems Summaries | | 31 |
| Effect of Changing Variables on Performance Standards | | 39 |
| Worksheet 13: | Model Adjusted Worksheet for Analyzing Client Characteristic Performance – Adult | 43 |
| Worksheet 14: | Model Adjusted Worksheet for Analyzing Client Characteristic Performance – Youth | 44 |
| Worksheet 15: | Model Adjusted Worksheet for Analyzing Client Characteristic Performance - Adult Post Program | 45 |
| Worksheet 16: | Model Adjusted Worksheet for Analyzing Client Characteristic Performance - Adult Welfare | 45 |
| NAB Regional Service Office List | | 48 |

## Acknowledgments

The original version of this guide was written by the Employment and Training Institute, Inc. and funded by the New Jersey Department of Labor through the Center for Human Resources, Institute for Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University.

This guide, in its present form, was further developed and refined by Steven Golightly of the National Alliance of Business and Kenneth Ryan of the Employment and Training Institute, Inc..

A special thanks is extended to Kathleen Hacker for her creative and diligent document production.

## Introduction

The Job Training Partnership Act is designed to be a performance-driven program. Performance standards are the tools that are used to assure that job training programs are a productive investment in human capital.

To fulfill the Secretary's mandate and assure that the goals of the Job Training Partnership Act are achieved, the U.S. Department of Labor has selected twelve performance measures, established a national standard for each measure, and designed a national adjustment methodology for adapting the national standards to local conditions. States must set standards for local service delivery areas for eight of the twelve, using either DOL's adjustment methodology or their own adjustment methodology established within parameters set by the Secretary. States must also determine whether these standards have been met, provide technical assistance, reward performance, and impose sanctions when standards are not met for two years. Governors must also set an entered employment rate standard for Title III formula funded programs and establish a goal for Title III wage at placement. Service delivery areas must formulate policies and operate programs that will meet or exceed the state-established performance standards, but they are encouraged to seek further adjustments if local conditions warrant.

Clearly, the most challenging aspects of implementing the new performance standards system fall to professionals at the local level. It is there that policies are made and programs are shaped. The purpose of this guide is to provide local policy makers and program managers with an approach for using performance standards as a tool for reviewing and improving performance at the local level. The guide is keyed to the PY 88 DOL adjustment methodology for activities beginning July 1, 1988. Earlier versions of this guide, which include the PY 84 through PY 87 models, are available through the National Alliance of Business. An outline of the guide follows.

**Section I: Overview of Performance Standards** – This section discusses the evolution of and rationale supporting performance standards.

**Section II: Identification of Local Performance** – This section details a systematic approach to obtaining comprehensive baseline data on local performance, an analysis of the performance of specific activities and contractors within the SDA, an analysis of performance trends, and a comparison with other SDAs.

**Section III: Strategies for Improving Performance** – This section describes two approaches for improving performance: first, the Oversight Response, which identifies probable causes of poor performance, and second, the Planning Response, which provides tools to examine new strategies and approaches that will improve performance.

**Section IV: Conclusion** – This section summarizes the key issues related to planning and managing with performance standards.

Readers are cautioned not to rely solely on performance standards to plan, manage, and evaluate JTPA; performance standards are only one measure of the effectiveness of JTPA. The mission established by the private industry council (PIC) and local elected officials may make other goals as significant as achieving the performance standards. For example, the use of JTPA in effecting institutional change at the local level or the use of JTPA in promoting job creation and economic development activities could be as important as local performance measures and must be considered in the self-evaluation process.

Many of the reports and worksheets presented in the guide require routine, yet time-consuming, computations using local participant and financial data. A software option is available for microcomputer users that speeds up the analysis and allows for graphic presentation of data. This program operates on MS DOS 2.0 and higher and requires an IBM PC, XT, AT or true compatible with a minimum of 256 K. The cost of the software is $399.00 with future year updates priced at $50.00. For more information on the software, contact the Employment and Training Institute at 1-800-932-0085.

The software option includes the following reports and worksheets which are referenced in this guide:

| Title | Worksheet Number |
|---|---|
| Performance Status Report | 1 |
| Performance Status Graph | 2 |
| Analysis of Enrollments and Expenditures | 3 |
| Performance of Terminees by Characteristic – Adult | 4 |
| Performance of Terminees by Characteristic – Youth | 5 |

Analysis of Programs and Contractors – Adult 6

Analysis of Programs and Contractors – Youth 7

Model Adjusted Worksheet for Analyzing Client Characteristic Performance – Adult 13

Model Adjusted Worksheet for Analyzing Client Characteristic Performance – Youth 14

Model Adjusted Worksheet for Analyzing Client Characteristic Performance - Adult Post Program 15

Model Adjusted Worksheet for Analyzing Client Characteristic Performance - Welfare 16

## Section I: Overview of Performance Standards

Throughout the 20-year evolution of Federal job training programs the government, local policy makers, and practitioners have agreed on the need to assess program performance. An equitable method of assessing these local programs, however, was a complex issue. Each community has a unique set of circumstances which directly affects its ability to operate effective job training programs. A program in an urban setting with a high unemployment rate serving a high percentage of "hard to serve" individuals may be performing well if 40 percent of trainees are placed in jobs. A similar program in a suburban setting with a low unemployment rate serving a low percentage of "hard to serve" individuals may be performing poorly if only 40 percent of trainees are placed in jobs. Since no standard method of making adjustments for local variables was available, the expected performance of past programs was determined by negotiations between local program operators and representatives of the Department of Labor.

Performance standards under JTPA are different: They allow for local variations in measuring the effectiveness of job training programs. Thus, performance standards have become an "adjustment system" in which the actual local standard reflects such factors as who is served and local economic conditions. For example, an SDA with a low unemployment rate serving a low percentage of difficult-to-place trainees will have comparatively high standards of performance. In contrast, an SDA with high unemployment serving a high percentage of difficult-to-place trainees will have relatively low standards of performance. If the model works as intended, the second SDA would not be penalized because of difficult local conditions; its standards would be adjusted downward.

The specific methodology incorporated in performance standards has evolved over the last six years. For the next two year planning cycle (PY 88 - PY 89) five new measures have been added to the original seven performance standards. These are: a youth employability enhancement measure and four post-program follow-up measures designed to assess the long-term impact of JTPA services. Governors are required to establish numerical performance standards in each SDA for at least eight of the 12 Federal standards. Governors are also required to establish a numerical standard for the entered employment rate in Title III (Dislocated Worker) Programs and are encouraged to establish an average wage at placement goal for Title III terminees.

The Federal strategy for meeting performance management goals includes encouraging governors to use the authority granted to them under JTPA to further adjust SDA performance standards to address broader performance management concerns. THE GUIDE FOR SETTING JTPA TITLE II-A PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR PY 88, published by the U.S. Department of Labor is an essential resource for seeking such adjustments.

The performance standards system is the first attempt to establish a national system for judging program performance that allows adjustment for the local factors that affect performance. In developing its adjustment approach, the Department of Labor analyzed data on prior programs and chose variables which were found to have a significant impact on performance. Each variable was weighted according to its average impact on performance. For example, by plotting the data from hundreds of communities, it was found that serving more dropouts resulted in fewer placements. The influence of this factor was determined mathematically and a corresponding weight was assigned. The current methodology is an extension of this simple example. Ultimately 23 variables were found to affect performance significantly and are included in the model. Several critical policy issues were addressed in the establishment of the current methodology. Many of these issues included technical items such as statistical modeling, selection of data bases from CETA and JTPA, and tolerance level adjustments. Three of the most significant areas addressed deal with the selection of the performance measures, the establishment of national standards, and the identification of the local adjustment factors. A description of each of these issues follows.

**Specific Performance Measures**

The twelve performance measures selected by the Department of Labor include four measures for adult programs, four measures for youth programs and four measures for adult post-program performance under Title IIA. Separate measures were established for the youth and adult populations based on the differing needs and historical results for each population.

**Adult Measures**

- Entered Employment Rate – the number of adults who entered employment at termination as a percentage of the total number of adults who terminated.

- Welfare Entered Employment Rate – the number of adult welfare recipients who entered employment at termination as a

percentage of the total number of adult welfare recipients who terminated.

- Average Wage at Placement – average hourly wage for all adults who entered employment at the time of termination.

- Cost per Entered Employment – total expenditures for adults divided by the number of adults who entered employment.

**Youth Measures**

- Entered Employment Rate – the number of youth who entered employment as a percentage of the number of youth who terminated.

- Positive Termination Rate – the number of youth who had a positive termination as a percentage of all youth who terminated. Positive terminations include entered employment, obtained employability enhancements, or attained PIC-approved youth competencies.

- Cost per Positive Termination – total expenditures for youth divided by the number of youth who had a positive termination.

- Employability Enhancement Rate - the number of youth who attained one of the employability enhancements whether or not they also obtained a job as a percentage of the total number of youth who terminated. Youth Employability Enhancements include:

  a. Attained PIC-Recognized Youth Employment Competencies.

  b. Entered Non-Title II Training

  c. Completed Major Level of Education

  d. Completed Program Objectives (14-15 year olds).

**Post-Program Measures**

- Follow-up Employment Rate -- the number of Adult respondents who were employed during the 13th Week after program termination as a percentage of the total of all respondents (terminees who completed follow-up interview)

- Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate -- the number of Adult Welfare respondents who were unemployed during the 13th

week after program termination as a percentage of the total of all adult welfare respondents.

- Weekly earnings at Follow-up -- total gross weekly earnings of respondents who were employed at the 13th week divided by the total number of respondents employed at the 13th week.

- Weeks Worked in the Follow-up Period -- total number of weeks worked in the 13 week follow-up period for all respondents divided by the total number of respondents.

**Performance Standards Title IIA**

The Secretary of Labor established national performance standards (specific numerical levels) for each of the twelve measures based on an analysis of prior accomplishments. The Secretary's standards have been set at a point at which 75% of the SDAs are expected to exceed based on previous performance. This differs from prior years when meeting the Secretary's standards simply represented average performance. The national performance standards are as follows:

Adult Standards

| | |
|---|---|
| Entered Employment Rate | 68% |
| Welfare Entered Employment Rate | 56% |
| Average Wage at Placement | $4.95 |
| Cost per Entered Employment | $4,500.00 |

Youth Standards

| | |
|---|---|
| Entered Employment Rate | 45% |
| Positive Termination Rate | 75% |
| Cost per Positive Termination | $4,900.00 |
| Employability Enhancement Rate | 30% |

For Post Program

| | |
|---|---|
| Follow-up Employment Rate | 60% |
| Welfare Follow-up Employment Rate | 50% |
| Weeks Worked in the Follow-up Period | 8 |
| Weekly Earnings of all Employed at Follow-up | $177.00 |

**Local Adjustment Factors**

The factors that are considered in adjusting the national standards for local conditions fall into three categories: the characteristics of those served, the length of training, and local economic conditions.

Who Is Served

The following trainee characteristics were found to affect performance significantly. They are either included in the law or are used in the adjustment model.

1. Female
2. Age 14 - 15
3. Age 16-17
4. Age 30 +
5. Black
6. Hispanic
7. Asian/Pacific Islander
8. Dropout
9. Student
10. Post high school attendee
11. AFDC Recipient
12. GA/RCA Recipient
13. Unemployment compensation claimant
14. Handicapped
15. Offender
16. Person not in labor force
17. Unemployed 15 + weeks

Length of Training / Percent Terminees

Factors such as the length of training and percent of individuals in classroom and on-the-job (OJT) training were found to influence performance. However, for a variety of reasons, only one factor dealing with the length of the training program is included in the national model.

This factor takes into account the percentage of participants who terminate during the program year and only influences the two performance measures dealing with cost. Experience has shown that programs carrying over more participants into the next program year tend to have higher costs than those programs that carry over fewer participants.

Local Economic Conditions

Five factors which reflect local economic conditions are included in the model: local average wage, unemployment rate, population density, number of families below poverty level, and employee /resident worker ratio.

The state may establish an SDA's performance standards using DOL's adjustment methodology or its own adjustment methodology established within the parameters set by DOL. This adjustment takes into consideration local SDA conditions and calculates a numerical performance level for each of the twelve measures. SDAs must plan and operate programs to meet the established standards or seek adjustments to the state-established standards when local conditions warrant. The ability to perform at or above the standard is largely dependent on the policy direction provided by the PIC and the planning and management skills of local administrators.

The remainder of this guide provides an approach and some tools that will enable SDA/PIC staff to use the performance standards system as a "point of departure" for improving planning and management practices.

## Section II: Identification of Local Performance

In order to begin a serious examination of performance, an SDA must have accurate, complete program information available on a continuous basis. A sound management information system is essential. Without these resources a manager does not have the ability to determine the status of current activities and cannot begin the process of improving performance. This first level of review, which includes calculating current performance, baseline program review, and trend and comparison analysis, allows the SDA to conduct a comprehensive analysis of overall performance. The following reports are required for this review:

- State prepared SDA report
- Locally prepared program reports

### Calculating Current Performance

Calculating your current performance enables you to take a snapshot of local SDA performance and compare it to the twelve primary JTPA performance standards, either as approved in your Job Training Plan or as adjusted based on actual experience. Worksheet 1, Performance Status Report, will provide a report on current performance (actual performance) in relation to planned or readjusted performance standards (expected performance). The readjusted standards are obviously the most accurate way to analyze your performance since they base your standard on the actual characteristics of terminees, percent terminated, and current local economic data. For SDAs that wish to include the readjusted standards, Worksheets 13, 14, and 15 provide the methodology to generate readjusted standards. Depending on which method has been selected by your state to calculate the Welfare Entered Employment Rate, you may also need Worksheet 16. The Performance Status Report indicates how close you are to meeting your standards. The required information may be available through existing systems either within your SDA or from the state.

The following information is required to complete Worksheet 1.

1. Number of adults terminated
2. Number of adults entered employment
3. Total adult expenditures
4. Total youth expenditures
5. Average hourly wage at placement (adults)
6. Number of adult welfare recipients terminated
7. Number of adult welfare recipients entered employment
8. Number of youth terminations
9. Number of youth entered employment
10. Number of youth positive terminations
11. Number of youth employability enhancements

12. Number of adults employed 13 weeks after program termination
13. Number of Adult Welfare respondents employed 13 weeks after program termination
14. Average number of weeks worked in the 13 week period after program termination for adults
15. Average gross weekly earnings of all respondents employed at the 13th week after program termination
16. Planned performance standards (Job Training Plan) or re-adjusted standards as calculated on Worksheets 13, 14, and 15

If information on any category is unavailable, it is not possible to identify your current level of performance in relation to the twelve key performance standards. Adjustments to your Management Information System may be required.

Worksheets 1 and 2 are designed to provide an ongoing analysis capability, allowing SDAs to increase the frequency of performance analysis beyond that currently provided by state and local standardized reports.

**Baseline Program Review**

Baseline program review helps identify probable causes of poor performance through a comprehensive review of program outcomes and client characteristics. It begins the process of narrowing down the specific areas which influence performance by gathering data on program and subcontractor performance.

This process begins with an initial review of total enrollments and expenditures. Deviations from plan in the areas of total served, youth service levels, and expenditure rates will have a dramatic impact on actual performance. Worksheet 3 provides a suggested format for this review. This review may indicate, for example, that although expenditures are 90 percent of plan, adult and youth enrollments are only 60 percent of plan. This situation may result in failure to meet the cost standards since this would increase the "cost per" outcome significantly.

The next two steps in the baseline program review process involve a detailed analysis of actual performance: first by target groups and then by programs or contractors. Worksheets 4 and 5 will enable an SDA to analyze, by performance standard, youth and adult outcomes by terminee characteristics. Worksheets 6 and 7 will enable an SDA to analyze, by performance standard, youth and adult outcomes by

Worksheet 1

# PERFORMANCE STATUS REPORT

**Report Period:** _____

## SECTION 1

| Enter Current Values in Columns A, B, and C | A Adult | B Welfare | C Youth |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Number of Terminees | | | |
| 2. Number Placed | | | |
| 3. Positive Terminations | | | |
| 4. Employability Enhancements | | | |
| 5. Average Wage at Placement | | | |
| 6. Total Program Cost | | | |
| 7. F/U Employment Rate | | | |
| 8. F/U Weeks Worked | | | |
| 9. F/U Weekly Earnings | | | |

## SECTION 2

| Enter Actual and Expected Performance and % of Standard | | A Adult | B Welfare | C Youth |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entered Employment Rate | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |
| Cost per Entered Employment | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |
| Average Wage at Placement | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |
| Positive Termination Rate | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |
| Cost per Positive Termination | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |
| Employability Enhancement Rate | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |
| Follow-Up Employment Rate | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |
| Follow-Up Weeks Worked | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |
| Follow-Up Weekly Earnings | Actual Performance | | | |
| | Expected Performance | | | |
| | % of Standard | | | |

**Worksheet 2** Report Period _____

**PERFORMANCE STATUS GRAPH**

Transfer totals for expected performance (EP) and actual performance (AP) from Worksheet 1 **PERFORMANCE STATUS REPORT** to complete the following bar graphs.

**ADULT**

| ENTERED EMPLOYMENT | | | WELFARE ENTERED EMPLOYMENT | | | COST PER ENTERED EMPLOYMENT | | | WAGE AT PLACEMENT | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % | EP | AP | % | EP | AP | | EP | AP | | EP | AP |
| | | | | | | $8000 | | | $6.25 | | |
| 100 | | | 100 | | | 7500 | | | 6.00 | | |
| 90 | | | 90 | | | 7000 | | | 5.75 | | |
| 80 | | | 80 | | | 6500 | | | 5.50 | | |
| 70 | | | 70 | | | 6000 | | | 5.25 | | |
| 60 | | | 60 | | | 5500 | | | 5.00 | | |
| 50 | | | 50 | | | 5000 | | | 4.75 | | |
| 40 | | | 40 | | | 4500 | | | 4.50 | | |
| 30 | | | 30 | | | 4000 | | | 4.25 | | |
| 20 | | | 20 | | | 3500 | | | 4.00 | | |
| 10 | | | 10 | | | 3000 | | | 3.75 | | |
| 0 | | | 0 | | | 2500 | | | 3.50 | | |
| | | | | | | 2000 | | | 3.25 | | |
| | | | | | | 1500 | | | 3.00 | | |
| | | | | | | 1000 | | | 2.75 | | |
| | | | | | | 500 | | | | | |

**YOUTH**

| ENTERED EMPLOYMENT | | | COST PER POSITIVE TERMINATION | | | POSITIVE TERMINATION | | | EMPLOYABILITY ENHANCEMENT | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % | EP | AP | | EP | AP | % | EP | AP | % | EP | AP |
| | | | $7000 | | | | | | | | |
| 100 | | | 6500 | | | 100 | | | 100 | | |
| 90 | | | 6000 | | | 90 | | | 90 | | |
| 80 | | | 5500 | | | 80 | | | 80 | | |
| 70 | | | 5000 | | | 70 | | | 70 | | |
| 60 | | | 4500 | | | 60 | | | 60 | | |
| 50 | | | 4000 | | | 50 | | | 50 | | |
| 40 | | | 3500 | | | 40 | | | 40 | | |
| 30 | | | 3000 | | | 30 | | | 30 | | |
| 20 | | | 2500 | | | 20 | | | 20 | | |
| 10 | | | 2000 | | | 10 | | | 10 | | |
| 0 | | | 1500 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| | | | 1000 | | | | | | | | |
| | | | 500 | | | | | | | | |

**WORKSHEET 3** Report Period _____

**ANALYSIS OF ENROLLMENTS AND EXPENDITURES**

| | 12 Month Planned | % of Total | Planned | % of Total | Actual | % of Total | % of Planned for Period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Enrollments (Total) | | | | | | | |
| Adult | | | | | | | |
| Youth | | | | | | | |
| Expenditures (Total) | | | | | | | |
| Adult | | | | | | | |
| Youth | | | | | | | |
| Detail of Total Expenditures | | | | | | | |
| Administration | | | | | | | |
| Salary & Fringe | | | | | | | |
| Operating Costs | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | |
| Training | | | | | | | |
| Salary & Fringe | | | | | | | |
| Occupational Training | | | | | | | |
| Other Classroom Training | | | | | | | |
| OJT | | | | | | | |
| Special Programs | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | |
| Services | | | | | | | |
| Needs Based Payments | | | | | | | |
| Support Services | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | |

WORKSHEET 4 Report Period _____

PERFORMANCE OF TERMINEES BY CHARACTERISTIC – ADULT

| CHARACTERISTICS | Actual Terminees | | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # | % | Entered Employment Rate | Cost Per Entered Employment | Average Wage | Follow-Up Employment Rate | Follow-Up Weeks Worked | Follow-Up Weekly Earnings |
| Male | | | | | | | | |
| Female | | | | | | | | |
| Age 30 + | | | | | | | | |
| Black | | | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | | | |
| Dropout | | | | | | | | |
| UC Claimant | | | | | | | | |
| Unempl. 15 + | | | | | | | | |
| Not in Labor Force | | | | | | | | |
| AFDC | | | | | | | | |
| GA/RCA | | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | | | |
| Others (Optional) | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

**WORKSHEET 5** Report Period _____

**PERFORMANCE OF TERMINEES BY CHARACTERISTIC – YOUTH**

| CHARACTERISTICS | Actual Terminees | | ACTUAL PERFORMANCE | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # | % | Entered Employment Rate | Positive Termination Rate | Cost Per Positive Termination | Employment Enhancement Rate |
| Male | | | | | | |
| Female | | | | | | |
| Age 14 – 15 | | | | | | |
| Age 16 – 17 | | | | | | |
| White | | | | | | |
| Black | | | | | | |
| Hispanic | | | | | | |
| Alaskan Native/American Indian | | | | | | |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | | | | | | |
| Dropout | | | | | | |
| Student | | | | | | |
| Not in Labor Force | | | | | | |
| Post High School Attendee | | | | | | |
| AFDC Recipient | | | | | | |
| GA / RCA Recipient | | | | | | |
| Handicapped | | | | | | |
| Offender | | | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | |
| Others (Optional) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

**WORKSHEET 6**

Report Period _____

**ANALYSIS OF PROGRAMS/CONTRACTORS – ADULT**

| Programs/Contracts | PERFORMANCE DATA | | | | POST PROGRAM FOLLOW-UP | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Entered Employment Rate | Welfare Entered Employment Rate | Cost Per Entered Employment | Average Wage at Placement | Follow-up Employment Rate | Follow-up Weeks Worked | Follow-up Avg. Weekly Earnings |
| Occupational Training | | | | | | | |
| 1. | | | | | | | |
| 2. | | | | | | | |
| 3. | | | | | | | |
| 4. | | | | | | | |
| 5. | | | | | | | |
| 6. | | | | | | | |
| Total Occupational Training | | | | | | | |
| Other Classroom Training | | | | | | | |
| 1. Job Finding Skills | | | | | | | |
| 2. Remedial Programs | | | | | | | |
| A. | | | | | | | |
| B. | | | | | | | |
| 3. Special Programs | | | | | | | |
| A. | | | | | | | |
| B. | | | | | | | |
| C. | | | | | | | |
| OJT | | | | | | | |
| Other | | | | | | | |
| TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS | | | | | | | |

**WORKSHEET 7** Report Period _____

**ANALYSIS OF PROGRAMS/CONTRACTORS – YOUTH**

| Programs/Contracts | PERFORMANCE DATA | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Entered Employment Rate | Positive Termination Rate | Cost Per Positive Termination | Employability Enhancement Rate |
| Occupational Training<br>1.<br>2.<br>3.<br>4.<br>5.<br>6. | | | | |
| Total Occupational Training | | | | |
| Other Classroom Training<br>1. Job Finding Skills | | | | |
| 2. Remedial Programs<br>A.<br>B. | | | | |
| 3. Special Programs<br>A.<br>B.<br>C. | | | | |
| OJT | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| TOTAL ALL PROGRAMS | | | | |

program or contractor. Taken together these reports will, in most cases, help isolate problem areas and provide a starting point for corrective action. This information will also be useful when you are planning new strategies to improve performance since you will know what programs work best, for what groups, and at what cost.

Although the type of analysis that can be done using Worksheets 4-7 can be very useful in pinpointing problem areas, SDAs are cautioned not to apply the SDA's overall expected performance levels to all programs and contractors or to specific target groups.

Programs must be looked at in the context of varying client needs and service strategies. For example, if an SDA has an adult entered employment rate of 55 percent and a cost per entered employment of $5,800, the SDA might be tempted to identify programs and target groups performing below this level as "problem areas." But, upon closer review, such programs may be exceeding model-based performance expectations based on the characteristics of participants being served and the type of training being provided. Similarly, a long-term program serving dropouts with an entered employment rate of 43 percent and a cost per entered employment of $6,400 may not necessarily reduce overall performance.

Not all activities will produce outcomes consistent with the overall expected performance levels established for an SDA: some will produce higher results and some lower. The challenge is to construct a job training system that, *in total*, exceeds overall established performance levels.

While analysis of the performance of specific program activities and subcontractors and the outcomes for specific client groups can be guided to a certain extent by the DOL model, DOL warns that a strict application of the model in these instances would be inappropriate.

**Trend and Comparison Analysis**

Once you have calculated your current level of performance and completed your baseline program review, you may want to conclude your overall performance analysis by examining performance trends and by comparing current performance with past SDA performance or with the performance of comparable SDAs. In order to complete both the comparison and trend steps you will need the following information:

1. Prior year's performance standards
2. Performance reports (available from this section)
3. Planned performance goals contained in the Job Training Plan
4. Statewide performance reports (available through your state JTPA office)

**Trend Analysis**

Trend analysis allows the SDA to visualize, on a regular basis, performance variations over a longer period of time. With this type of analysis PIC members and SDA staff will easily be able to determine the direction in which the program is going. They can then take corrective action when a downward trend becomes apparent rather than waiting for performance to fall hopelessly below the standard.

Performance may fluctuate at monthly or quarterly review points for legitimate reasons. Fluctuations in performance may have a number of explanations: closed entry courses, late program start-ups, or funding delays. Trend analysis may help pinpoint a potential problem area. It may indicate, for example, that your particular SDA has developed a trend of decreasing entered employment rates with increased cost per placement for a six month period. These trends would then be considered in analyzing SDA performance.

Use Worksheets 8 and 9 to maintain an ongoing record of trends for each of the two performance standards groups, adult and youth. Worksheet 10 can be used to track each standard on a yearly or more frequent basis.

**Comparison Analysis**

Comparison analysis offers a broader perspective on "how you're doing." Comparison analysis provides you with the opportunity to compare your current performance with:

- Past local SDA experience
- Performance of comparable SDAs (economy, labor market, and unemployment rate similarities)
- Statewide SDA performance

The approved performance standards in your Job Training Plan represent <u>minimal</u> expectations. Many SDAs have established more ambitious performance goals or have planned incremental improvements in selected standards. You may find, for example, that although you have met all of your performance standards,

comparable SDAs are exceeding standards. Many SDAs are now competing for a portion of the "incentive" funds that are awarded by the states, thus, comparison analysis takes on new meaning.

Use Worksheet 12 to record and compare your SDA performance with various jurisdictions within a state. This worksheet enables the SDA to examine the extent to which individual standards were met by comparable SDAs. For example, if the SDA standard for adult entered employment is 55 percent and the actual performance is 52 percent, the chart would display the percent of standard at 94.5.

The approach and reports detailed in this section complete the first level of performance review and should provide sufficient information for SDAs to determine priority areas for further investigation and improvement. This baseline data should be carefully reviewed with local policy makers and professional staff. Section III: Strategies for Improving Performance describes steps that can be taken to improve performance – first the Oversight Response which helps pinpoint reasons for poor performance and then the Planning Response which helps identify new strategies for improved results. In almost all cases, an SDA will be involved in some combination of the Oversight Response and the Planning Response.

**WORKSHEET 8** Report Period _____

**ADULT TREND ANALYSIS**

Complete the bottom portion of the worksheet and graph the quarterly/monthly trends in performance standards.

| % of Standard | Period Ending | Period Ending | Period Ending | Period Ending |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 150% | | | | |
| 140% | | | | |
| 130% | | | | |
| 120% | | | | |
| 110% | | | | |
| 100% | | | | |
| 90% | | | | |
| 80% | | | | |
| 70% | | | | |
| 60% | | | | |
| 50% | | | | |
| 40% | | | | |

| Performance Standards | Legend | % of Standard | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entered Emp. | ——— | | | | |
| Cost Per E.E. | ..... | | | | |
| Welfare E.E. | - - - - - | | | | |
| Wage at Plcmt. | ═══ | | | | |

**WORKSHEET 9** Report Period _____

## YOUTH TREND ANALYSIS

Complete the bottom portion of the worksheet and graph the quarterly/monthly trends in performance standards.

| % of Standard | Period Ending | Period Ending | Period Ending | Period Ending |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 150% | | | | |
| 140% | | | | |
| 130% | | | | |
| 120% | | | | |
| 110% | | | | |
| 100% | | | | |
| 90% | | | | |
| 80% | | | | |
| 70% | | | | |
| 60% | | | | |
| 50% | | | | |
| 40% | | | | |

| Performance Standards | Legend | % of Standard | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Entered Emp. | ——— | | | | |
| Positive Term. | . . . . . | | | | |
| Cost/Pos. Term. | — — — — | | | | |
| Emp. Enhan. | ======== | | | | |

**WORKSHEET 10** Report Period _____

**POST PROGRAM TREND ANALYSIS**

Complete the bottom portion of the worksheet and graph the quarterly/monthly trends in performance standards.

| % of Standard | Period Ending | Period Ending | Period Ending | Period Ending |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 150% | | | | |
| 140% | | | | |
| 130% | | | | |
| 120% | | | | |
| 110% | | | | |
| 100% | | | | |
| 90% | | | | |
| 80% | | | | |
| 70% | | | | |
| 60% | | | | |
| 50% | | | | |
| 40% | | | | |

| Performance Standards | Legend | % of Standard | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| F/U Emp. Rate | ——— | | | | |
| F/U Weeks Wkd. | ····· | | | | |
| F/U Wel. Emp. | – – – – – | | | | |
| F/U Wkly. Wage | ═══ | | | | |

**WORKSHEET 11** Report Period _____

**TREND ANALYSIS BY STANDARD**

Select the performance standard, complete the bottom portion of the worksheet and graph the results.

**Performance Standard** _____

| % of Standard | | Period Ending | Period Ending | Period Ending | Period Ending |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 150% | | | | | |
| 140% | | | | | |
| 130% | | | | | |
| 120% | | | | | |
| 110% | | | | | |
| 100% | | | | | |
| 90% | | | | | |
| 80% | | | | | |
| 70% | | | | | |
| 60% | | | | | |
| 50% | | | | | |
| 40% | | | | | |
| PY 86 | EP | | | | |
| Legend | AP | | | | |
| - - - - - | % | | | | |
| PY 87 | EP | | | | |
| Legend | AP | | | | |
| ..... | % | | | | |
| PY 88 | EP | | | | |
| Legend | AP | | | | |
| ═══ | % | | | | |

**WORKSHEET 12** Report Period _____

**COMPARISON ANALYSIS**

Fill in the following **worksheet** using percent of standard accomplished within your SDA (Column A) and other comparable SDAs and/or the state as a whole (Columns B–E). Fill in actual values for lines 8-11 (e.g., retention rate 85% = 85% of placements still working after 60 days).

| | A<br>User SDA | B<br>Other<br>_____ | C<br>Other<br>_____ | D<br>Other<br>_____ | E<br>Other<br>_____ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Adult Entered Employment Rate | | | | | |
| 2. Cost Per Entered Employment | | | | | |
| 3. Welfare Entered Employment Rate | | | | | |
| 4. Average Wage at Placement | | | | | |
| 5. Youth Entered Employment Rate | | | | | |
| 6. Youth Positive Termination Rate | | | | | |
| 7. Cost Per Positive Termination | | | | | |
| 8. Youth Employability Enhan. Rate | | | | | |
| 9. Follow-up Employment Rate Adult | | | | | |
| 10. Follow-up Empl. Rate Adult Wlfr. | | | | | |
| 11. Follow-up Weeks Worked | | | | | |
| 12. Follow-up Weekly Earnings | | | | | |

## Section III: Strategies For Improving Performance

The USDOL has significantly revised the Federal performance standards for PY 88. The general objective of the changes in the performance standards is to send a clear message to the JTPA system that resources and effort should be focused on those individuals with multiple barriers to employment and those program components which provide long-term benefit to participant labor market success. This policy direction supports the congressional intent in establishing JTPA.

For SDAs that need or want to improve performance, there are basically two approaches to take. The "Oversight Response" option helps pinpoint the factors in your existing programs and systems which are causing performance problems. The "Planning Response" option helps identify new strategies for improving your performance. Both responses should be viewed as ways of validating or modifying the key policies established by the PIC and elected officials.

### Oversight Response

Once the key activities causing poor performance have been identified, the next step is to understand why performance is not meeting expectations. The "Oversight Response" provides the SDA with a diagnostic tool to review and identify the factors that contribute to poor performance.

In order for JTPA to function effectively at the local level, a complex and interrelated set of program and administrative systems must be in place. These systems and procedures cover a broad range, including areas such as participant assessment, job development, contracting, MIS, supportive services, and classroom training. These systems are operated either directly by the administrative entity or, in some cases, subcontracted to local service providers.

These basic elements are classified in the following three categories:

JTPA Services and Programs – This is the most critical component of the employment and training system and includes the following activities: outreach, eligibility determination, assessment, employability counseling, supportive services (including needs-based payments), job development, classroom training, on-the-job training, try-out employment, work experience, and other special programs.

Administrative and Management Systems – The quality and effectiveness of JTPA programs and services are directly determined

by the basic management and administrative systems which shape and support them. The most critical elements here include: planning (including youth competencies), organizational structure and staffing, fiscal management, MIS, contracting, and monitoring.

Organizational Roles and Relationships – JTPA allows wide latitude in determining the roles and relationships formed in local SDAs. The scope and nature of these roles can have a profound influence on the quality and cost effectiveness of the programs and services provided under JTPA. The critical areas here include: responsibilities of the grant recipient and administrative entity, planning responsibilities, and cooperative relationships with related agencies such as job service, economic development, welfare, and other special purpose agencies.

The Performance Status Reports, Baseline Program Review Reports, and Trend and Comparison Analysis Reports detailed in Section II can provide you with an abundance of data which offer specific "access points" to program areas, contractors, or activities with performance problems. Failure to meet a given performance standard should be viewed by management as a flag of a possible problem. However, the performance standards model cannot tell the program manager exactly what the problem is.

Using the observed performance problem as the departure point, the Oversight Response enables the SDA to determine which of the basic employment and training systems may be causing the performance problem and provides specific guidance on both the areas to be reviewed and the method of review.

For example, suppose an SDA's actual cost per entered employment is substantially above the standard predicted by the model. The manager would first identify programs or contractors significantly above the standard. This could be determined from the baseline program review conducted in Section II. Assuming that the entered employment rate meets the standard, the problem could be isolated to the cost of training. The manager might then determine if the problem was caused at the planning level, the contracting level, or if the actual costs of training differ from planned and contracted terms. Thus, a review would be conducted of the planning and contracting systems of the SDA and the fiscal system of the specific programs or contractors. This oversimplified example does not address many important factors, but it does illustrate the type of

branching analysis that can pinpoint the cause of performance problems.

Some SDAs may opt for a total review of all the suggested systems in order to maximize performance rather than confine the review to programs identified as having problems in the baseline review. By conducting a complete review of all systems the SDA has an opportunity to approach performance improvement in a more comprehensive manner, allowing for, in most cases, a one-time alignment of these primary systems.

SDAs should use the Oversight Response Summary to identify the program, administrative, and organizational systems that may be causing poor performance; the JTPA systems which are most likely to influence the standard are marked with an X. Since all systems may affect performance standards to some extent, SDAs should be familiar with the interrelationship of the standards and concentrate their reviews on the primary problems.

Once an SDA has determined which systems should be examined further, it should refer to the Systems Summaries which provide guidance on both the areas to be reviewed and the method of review. Finally, appropriate corrective action plans should be formulated and implemented.

**Summary of Oversight Response Approach**

Step 1 – Identify specific performance measures needing improvement through Performance Status Report.

Step 2 – Identify programs, contractors, or problems with target groups which may be causing poor performance by using Worksheets 4, 5, 6, and 7. Make allowances for varying client needs and service strategies.

Step 3 – Identify probable systems causing poor performance either within the program or contractor or throughout the entire program using the Oversight Response Summary.

Step 4 – Use the Systems Summaries to conduct a review of each area identified above.

Step 5 – Design, implement, and follow-up on corrective action recommendations.

## OVERSIGHT RESPONSE SUMMARY

| | Most likely to influence entered employment rates and positive termination rates | | Most likely to influence cost standards | | Most likely to influence average wage at placement | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | System | Comments | System | Comments | System | Comments |
| **JTPA Services & Programs** | | | | | | |
| **Services** | | Initial outreach and assessment (matching client to training) directly affect dropout rate. | | | | |
| Outreach | X | | | | | |
| Eligibility Determination | | | | | | |
| Assessment | X | Ongoing counseling, needs-based payments, and other supportive services also affect retention. The job development effort is most critical to these standards. | | | | |
| Counseling | X | | | | | |
| Needs Based System | X | | | | | |
| Other Supportive Services | X | | X | Cost of needs-based payments and supportive services affects cost standards | | Job development most directly affects this standard. |
| Job Development/Placement | X | | X | | X | |
| **Programs** | | | | | | |
| Skill Training | X | The quality of training and OJT slots directly affects these standards. | X | A significant variance in average length of training and actual cost will affect the cost standards. | X | The nature and quality of training and OJT affect the starting wage of completers. |
| Other Classroom Training | | | X | | | |
| Special Target Programs | X | | X | | X | |
| Work Experience | | | | | | |
| OJT | X | | X | | X | |
| **Administration & Management Systems** | | Planning in demand occupations is essential. | | | | |
| Planning (including youth competencies) | X | Status of youth competency system will have a dramatic effect on positive termination rate. | X | Inadequate youth competency system will affect "cost per" standards. | X | Problems may occur at the planning or contracting stage. |
| Organization/Staffing | | | X | | | |
| Fiscal | | Accurate MIS is required, as well as clear, performance-type contracts, in order to meet standards. | X | Problems with cost and length of training may occur at the planning, contracting, or implementation stage. | | |
| MIS | X | | X | | | |
| Contracting | X | | X | | | |
| Monitoring | | | X | | X | |
| **Organizational Roles & Relationships** | | | | | | |
| PIC–LEO Agreement | | Problems at this level could have a negative effect on all performance standards, depending on organizational structure. | | | | |
| Coordination with: | | | | | | |
| Job Service | | The nature and vitality of coordination/linkage agreements with other agencies can have a significant influence on these standards. | | Cost-effective interagency agreements can dramatically affect these standards. | | Relationships with placement and job development/creation agencies will affect this standard. |
| Economic Development | | | | | | |
| Unemployment Insurance | | | | | | |
| Welfare | | | | | | |

## SYSTEMS SUMMARIES

## PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

### 1. OUTREACH

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Subrecipients' responsibilities
Linkages with community agencies serving targeted groups
Specific outreach goals by target group and geographic area
Outreach process - use of media, written material, personal contact

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review outreach goals by target group
Interview staff
Review sources of referrals
Track characteristics of applicants and enrollees

### 2. ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION/SELECTION

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Intake/eligibility process
Staff/subrecipient responsibilities
Length of time from application to enrollment
Characteristics of eligibles compared to those enrolled
Existence of specific goals

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review the eligibility system as described in JTPA
Examine application/eligibility determination process
Analyze characteristics of eligibles not enrolled

### 3. ASSESSMENT

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Administration of assessment
Staffing and organization
Quality of assessment
Relevance of assessment data to entrance criteria

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review assessment procedures and tools
Sample assessment files
Sample employability development plans
Review skills and characteristics of successful completers

### 4. COUNSELING

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Procedures for counseling throughout the JTPA system
Use of the EDP as an ongoing tool

METHOD OF REVIEW

Interview clients
Review client folders for progress reports
Determine caseload trends

## 5. NEEDS BASED PAYMENT SYSTEM/SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Methodology for needs-based payment determination
Consistency of such payments for different target groups and activities
Effect of payments and services on dropout rates and enrollment trends

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written procedures
Track dropout rates and underenrollment trends

## 6. JOB DEVELOPMENT/PLACEMENT

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Subrecipient responsibility
Performance-based contract usage
Coordination of job development with job service
Marketing plan and implementation

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Interview job development and placement staff
Review job orders and placement documentation
Track specific vocational training activities with poor wage rates

## 7. SKILL TRAINING/OTHER CLASSROOM TRAINING

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and structure of the course
Instructional materials
Staffing
Instructor's flexibility and responsiveness
Frequency and accuracy of trainee assessment

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Review course curriculum
Conduct site visits
Interview instructor and trainees

## 8. SPECIAL TARGET PROGRAMS

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Ability of targeted programs to increase participation of the "hard to serve"
Services and support provided to "hard to serve" populations

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Perform a desktop review of each targeted program
Review enrollments, positive terminations and placement data
Compare enrollee profile to SDA goals for target groups

9. WORK EXPERIENCE (YOUTH EXEMPLARY PROGRAMS)

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Characteristics of clients served in this category
Quality of training experience

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review work experience agreements
Conduct site visits
Interview SDA staff responsible for monitoring worksites
Interview participants
Review timesheets
Review progress reports

10. OJT

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Written procedures describing specific responsibilities
Linkages with other job development activity at subrecipient level
Procedures for marketing
OJT contract development

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review OJT contracts
Conduct site visits
Review completion rates

## ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

11. PLANNING

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Plan preparation
PIC involvement
Planning process
Youth competency system
Procedures for tracking performance of subcontractors
Procedures for collecting and distributing ongoing performance information

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written procedures
Interview staff
Review program evaluations
Review PIC input through interviews or review of minutes
Examine youth competency system procedures and monitor implementation

## 12. ORGANIZATION AND STAFFING

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Number and functions of staff
Lines of authority
Formal and informal methods of exchanging information
Staff training and development efforts
Ratios of service staff to client population

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Review organizational charts and job descriptions
Interview staff to validate lines of authority and information exchange procedures
Examine the reasonableness of agency departments or units
Analyze ratios of staff to clients for program and service systems

## 13. FISCAL

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Staffing and procedures
Budgeting procedures and cost categories
Accrual system, report preparation and distribution
Subrecipient reporting system
Timeliness of reports

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Review back-up of total JTPA budget and subrecipient budgets
Interview staff, review and validate monthly reports, accruals and report distribution

## 14. MIS

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Data collection
Expertise of MIS staff
Distribution of reports and validation process

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written procedures
Validate written procedures and definitions through interviews with staff
Track sample reports to source documents

## 15. CONTRACTING

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Soliciting proposals, evaluating proposals
Negotiating contracts, modifying contracts
Evaluating contracts
Staff expertise in federal, state, and local procurement regulations
Clarity of request for proposals
Specificity of contract goals and objectives

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written procedures
Interview staff
Track RFP process through contract execution and modification
Review use of performance contracts

---

16. MONITORING

---

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Organization and staffing
Monitoring procedures
Frequency and depth of monitoring and evaluation
Process for report distribution and corrective action
Utilization of evaluation results in planning and contract modification

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written procedures
Interview staff and determine the level and frequency of monitoring
Track reports through corrective action process
Determine the extent to which evaluations are used in the planning process

## ORGANIZATION AND COORDINATION

---

17. PIC – LEO AGREEMENT

---

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Clarity of roles and responsibilities
Procedures for developing job training plan
Level of involvement in policy guidance and oversight

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written agreement
Interview PIC members
Review PIC meeting minutes

---

18. JOB SERVICE

---

AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

SDA/Job Service coordination agreement
Staffing and organization
Information exchange
Client flow

METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written agreement
Interview Job Service and SDA staff
Track number and results of referrals

---

## 19. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Cooperative SDA/Economic Development agreements
Procedures used to share local economic development and labor market information
Information exchange:

- Listing of companies planning to relocate to the SDA
- Listing of companies anticipating expansion within the SDA
- Listing of planned or actual plant closings or reductions in force within the SDA

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written agreements
Interview staff of economic development agencies and SDA
Track results of any cooperative projects

## 20. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE DIVISION

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Coordination agreement with the local Unemployment Insurance Division
Procedures for timely information exchange and referral of UI claimants

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written procedures
Interview appropriate UI and SDA staff
Analyze number and results of UI referrals

## 21. WELFARE

### AREAS TO BE REVIEWED

Welfare recipient participation rates
Information exchange and referrals

### METHOD OF REVIEW

Review written procedures
Interview staff of public assistance agencies and SDA
Track numbers and results of referrals

**Planning Response**

In addition to correcting deficiencies identified through the "Oversight Response," most SDAs engage in what is termed the "Planning (or Replanning) Response." That is, they rethink key policy decisions, after examining the results, and initiate new policies in such critical planning areas as:

- **Who will be served**

  Job training funds are limited. Only a portion of the eligible population can be served in most communities. Beyond the Federal requirements to serve particular target groups, SDAs decide which groups of individuals will receive priority.

- **What services and programs will be provided**

  Taking into account the characteristics of the people who will be served, SDAs determine the mix of training, remedial programs, and services that will be offered and how financial resources will be allocated.

- **What will be acceptable performance standards**

  In addition to the minimum standards established by DOL and the governor, SDAs may develop additional performance guidelines or request waivers of state standards when appropriate.

The performance standards system, while establishing accountability for such policy and planning decisions, does not usurp this important local policy making role. In fact, one of the strengths of the performance standards system is that it does not reward or penalize SDAs for these types of policy choices, but simply holds them accountable for achieving performance standards which reflect those choices. SDAs which allow performance standards to "drive" the decisions in these key areas rather than consciously establishing policies will quickly get lost in a maze of variables and formulas at the expense of quality programs.

Local policy makers should, however, have a clear understanding of the mechanics of the performance standards system so that they can be aware of the performance-related implications of their decisions. The following list shows that 20 of the 23 adjustment variables which affect the computation of an SDA's expected performance are directly influenced by the SDA's policy making and planning decisions in the areas noted above.

**Adjustment Variables**

Influenced By SDA

Who Is Served

1. Female
2. Age 14–15
3. Age 16-17
4. Age 30 +
5. Black
6. Hispanic
7. Asian/Pacific Islander
8. Dropout
9. Student
10. Post High School Attendee
11. AFDC Recipient
12. GA/RCA Recipient
13. Unemployment Compensation Claimant
14. Handicapped
15. Offender
16. Person not in labor force
17. Unemployed 15 + weeks

What Type of Services and Programs Will be Provided

18. Percent Terminees

Not Influenced By SDA

19. Average Annual Wage in Wholesale/Retail Trade
20. Unemployment Rate
21. Population Density
22. Number of Families below Poverty Level
23. Employee/Resident Worker Ratio

Moreover, as can be seen on the "Effect of Changing Variables on Performance Standards" chart, SDAs can determine precisely what impact each of the variables will have on their expected performance. The variables across from each of the performance standards are listed in order of their significance. For example, the variable which most significantly decreases the adult entered employment rate is unemployment rate. The next most influential variable for decreasing this standard is GA/RCA Recipients.

**EFFECT OF CHANGING VARIABLES ON PERFORMANCE STANDARDS - 1988 Model**
(Listed in order of significance of impact)

| Performance Standard | Raises Standards if increased | Lowers Standards if increased |
|---|---|---|
| Entered Employment Rate – Adult<br><br>(The hierarchy of variables for Welfare Entered Employment Rate is the same as it is for Entered Employment Rate.) | 1. Population Density | 1. Unemployment Rate<br>2. GA/RCA Recipient<br>3. Dropout<br>4. Age 30 and Above<br>5. AFDC Recipient<br>6. Not in Labor Force<br>7. Female<br>8. Emp/Res Worker Ratio<br>9. Black<br>10. Unemployed 15 weeks or + |
| Average Wage at Placement Adult | 1. Average Annual Earnings in Retail/Wholesale Trade<br>2. Population Density<br>3. U. C. Claimant<br>4. Age 30 and Above | 1. Fam. Below Poverty Level<br>2. Dropout<br>3. Unemployment Rate<br>4. Female<br>5. Black<br>6. Empl/Res Worker Ratio<br>7. Unemployed 15 weeks or + |
| Entered Employment Rate – Youth | | 1. Unemployment Rate<br>2. 14-15 Years Old<br>3. GA/RCA Recipient<br>4. Student<br>5. Dropout<br>6. Handicapped<br>7. Black |
| Positive Termination Rate-- Youth | 1. Population Density<br>2. Post-H.S. Attendee<br>3. Student | 1. Asian/Pacific Islander<br>2. GA/RCA Recipient<br>3. Hispanic<br>4. Empl/Res Worker Ratio<br>5. Black |
| Employability Enhancement Rate -- Youth | 1. 14-15 Years Old<br>2. Student<br>3. Dropout<br>4. Not in Labor Force<br>5 16-17 Years Old<br>6. Female | 1. Handicapped<br>1. Black<br>3. GA/RCA Recipient<br>4. AFDC Recipient |
| Follow-Up Employment Rate -- Adult | 1. UC Claimant | 1. Unemployment Rate<br>2. GA/RCA Recipient<br>3. Offender<br>4. Black<br>5. Dropout<br>6. Age 30 and Above<br>7. AFDC Recipient<br>8. Not in Labor Force<br>9. Unemployed 15 weeks or + |

**EFFECT OF CHANGING VARIABLES ON PERFORMANCE STANDARDS - 1988 Model (cont.)**
(Listed in order of significance of impact)

| Performance Standard | Raises Standards if increased | Lowers Standards if increased |
|---|---|---|
| Follow-Up Weeks Worked -- Adult | | 1. Unemployment Rate<br>2. GA/RCA Recipient<br>3. Unemployed 15 weeks or +<br>4. Black<br>5. AFDC Recipient<br>6. Dropout |
| Follow-Up Weekly Earnings--Adult | 1. Avg. Annual Earnings in retail/Wholesale Trade<br>2. Population Density<br>3. UC Claimant<br>4. Age 30 and Above | 1. Unemployment Rate<br>2. Fam. Below Poverty Level<br>3. Female<br>4. Offender<br>5. Dropout<br>6. Empl/Res Worker Ratio<br>7. Unemployed 15 weeks or +<br>8. Black |
| **Raising/lowering the cost standards below has different implications than raising/lowering the eight standards listed above. Exceeding your standard for the two cost standards means actual performance lower than the standard.** | | |
| Cost Per Entered Employment--Adult | 1. Population Density<br>2. Avg. Annual Earnings in Retail/Wholesale Trade<br>3. Unemployment Rate<br>4. UC Claimant<br>5. AFDC Recipient<br>6. GA/RCA Recipient<br>7. Not in Labor Force<br>8. Hispanic | 1. % Terminees |
| Cost Per Positive Termination -- Youth | 1. Avg. Annual Earnings in Retail/Wholesale Trade<br>2. AFDC Recipient<br>3. Hispanic<br>4. Handicapped<br>5. Not in Labor Force | 1. % Terminees<br>2. Student<br>3. 14-15 Years Old |

It is important to note that the impact of specific variations on the overall standard is not, in most cases, substantial. The cumulative effect, however, can significantly change the local SDA standards.

Familiarity with the dynamics of the performance standards system will enable SDA staff to examine how local factors are shaping current expected performance and to determine what effect program modifications would have on future expected performance levels. By following the "examining impact" instructions on the next page and using Worksheets 12 and 13, an SDA can identify the extent to which each factor is increasing or decreasing their expected performance levels. Users should also compare local values with extreme factor values detailed in Section G of the Department of Labor **Guide For Setting JTPA Title II-A Performance Standards For PY 88**. The value of this exercise is in understanding how local factors have shaped current expected performance levels, not in determining the extent to which the SDA has deviated from the national averages.

Once an SDA has completed the type of analysis recommended in this guide, it may consider changes in program design or emphasis for the balance of the program year. The Baseline Program Review conducted in Section II provides valuable information for this replanning effort. Obviously any new program emphasis should be based on what has worked best, for what groups, and at what cost. By following the "dry run" instructions on the next page and using Worksheets 13, 14, 15 and 16, SDAs will be able to determine precisely what effect these various policy and planning options would have on their expected performance levels.

## INSTRUCTIONS FOR WORKSHEETS 13, 14, 15 AND 16

**Option A** - Recalculation Based on Actual Terminee Characteristics

This option enables SDAs to recalculate their expected performance standards based on the actual terminee characteristics.

Complete only Columns B, D, E, and F of the top section and Columns A, B, and C of the bottom section.

**Option B** - Examining Impact of Local Factors on Expected Performance Levels

This option enables SDAs to determine the extent to which local factors have increased or decreased expected performance levels. (Examine Columns D, E, and F to observe + or- effect of local factors on current expected performance levels.)

Complete only Columns B, D, E, and F of the top section.

**Option C** - Dry Run of Various Policy and Planning Options

This option enables the SDA to determine precisely what effect various policy and planning options would have on the expected performance.

Complete only Columns B, D, E, and F of the top section and Column B in the bottom section.

Description of top section columns

| | |
|---|---|
| Column A. | National average percent of terminees |
| Column B | Actual percent of terminees at the time of review |
| Column C | Percent of national average |
| Column D. | Calculates the effect on each standard indicated within the column (B1) actual terminee percent minus (A1) national standard times (.20) weight = effect |
| Column E. | Same as above |
| Column F. | Same as above |

Description of bottom section columns

| | |
|---|---|
| Column A. | Actual local measures |
| Column B. | Actual standards if calculated on actual current terminees (The SDA must add the effects from each column above and adjust the national standard to display the local model adjusted standard) |
| Column C. | Percent of standard |

**Worksheet 13**

| MODEL ADJUSTED WORKSHEET FOR ANALYZING CLIENT CHARACTERISTIC PERFORMANCE – ADULT - PY 88 | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variables | National | Actual | Percent | Standards Calculations | | | | | | | |
| | A. | B. | C. | D. | | E. | | F. | | | |
| Adult | | | [B/A] | Ent. Emp. Rate | | Cost/Ent. Emp. | | Average Wage | | | |
| 1. Female | 55.1 | | | [B1-A1(-.073)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B1-A1(-.0065)] | | | |
| 2. Age 30 + | 52.8 | | | [B2-A2(-.166)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B2-A2(.0033)] | | | |
| 3. Black | 23.2 | | | [B3-A3(-.055)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B3-A3(-.0051)] | | | |
| 4. Hispanic | 8.3 | | | //////////////////////// | | [B4-A4(6.2)] | | //////////////////////// | | | |
| 5. Dropout | 24.8 | | | [B5-A5(-.177)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B5-A5(-.0119)] | | | |
| 6. UC Claimant | 10.3 | | | //////////////////////// | | [B6-A6(34.5)] | | [B6-A6(.0290)] | | | |
| 7. Unempl. 15 + | 48.7 | | | [B7-A7(-.015)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B7-A7(-.0015)] | | | |
| 8. Not in Labor F | 11.9 | | | [B8-A8(-.082)] | | [B8-A8(8.0)] | | //////////////////////// | | | |
| 9. AFDC | 23.8 | | | [B9-A9(-.159)] | | [B9-A9(24.9)] | | //////////////////////// | | | |
| 10. GA/RCA | 5.2 | | | [B10-A10(-.312)] | | [B10-A10(15.2)] | | //////////////////////// | | | |
| 11. % Terminees | 73.2 | | | //////////////////////// | | [B11-A11(-22.0)] | | //////////////////////// | | | |
| 12. Unemp. Rate | 7.4 | | | [B12-A12(-.608)] | | [B12-A12(63.8)] | | [B12-A12(-.0089) | | | |
| 13. Avg. Earn R/W | 12.5 | | | //////////////////////// | | [B13-A13(79.0)] | | [B13-A13(.0936) | | | |
| 14. Pop. Density | 0.7 | | | [B14-A14(.633)] | | [B14-A14(79.5)] | | [B14-A14(.0880)] | | | |
| 15. Fam. Bel. Pov. | 9.7 | | | //////////////////////// | | //////////////////////// | | [B15-A15(-.0307) | | | |
| 16. Emp. Res Ratio | 99.9 | | | [B16-A16(-.064)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B16-A16(-.0040) | | | |
| | | | | NET EFFECT | _____ | NET EFFECT | _____ | NET EFFECT | _____ | | |

**Summary Section**

| Performance Standard | Calculated Standard | Actual Performance | % of Standard |
|---|---|---|---|
| Entered Employment Rate | "D" Net Effect = + 68.0 = | | |
| Cost per Entered Employment | "E" Net Effect = + $4500 = | | |
| Welfare Entered Employment | "D" Net Effect = + 68.0 ( x)* = | | |
| Wage at Placement | "F" Net Effect = + $4.95 = | | |

* (x) = Public Assistance Employment Ratio ( Method II )

**Worksheet 14**

## MODEL ADJUSTMENT WORKSHEET FOR ANALYZING CLIENT CHARACTERISTIC PERFORMANCE - YOUTH - PY 88

| Variables | Nat'l. | Actual | Pct. | Standards Calculations | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A. | B. | C. | D. | | E. | | F. | | G. | |
| Youth | | | [B/A] | Ent. Emp. Rate | | Pos. Term. Rate | | Emp. Enh. Rate | | Cost/Pos. Term | |
| 1. Female | 50.6 | | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | [B1-A1( + .064)] | | //////////////////// | |
| 2. Age 14-15 | 5.7 | | | [B2-A2(-.589)] | | //////////////////// | | [B2-A2( + .332)] | | [B2-A2(--9.5)] | |
| 3. Age 16-17 | 32.4 | | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | [B3-A3( + .070)] | | //////////////////// | |
| 4. Black | 27.9 | | | [B4-A4(-.058)] | | [B4-A4(-.045)] | | [B4-A4( -.071)] | | //////////////////// | |
| 5. Hispanic | 9.5 | | | //////////////////// | | [B5-A5(-.060)] | | //////////////////// | | [B5-A5( + 9.0)] | |
| 6. Asian / Pacific Islander | 2.0 | | | //////////////////// | | [B6-A6(-.122)] | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | |
| 7. Dropout | 25.2 | | | [B7-A7(-.273)] | | //////////////////// | | [B7-A7( + .139)] | | //////////////////// | |
| 8. Student | 39.6 | | | [B8-A8(-.369)] | | [B8-A8( + .027)] | | [B8-A8( + .253)] | | [B8-A8(-11.7)] | |
| 9. Post High School | 6.7 | | | //////////////////// | | [B9-A9( + .202)] | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | |
| 10. Handicapped | 15.9 | | | [B10-A10(-.068)] | | //////////////////// | | [B10-A10(-.103] | | [B10-A10( + 8.4)] | |
| 11. Not in Labor Force | 38.7 | | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | [B11-A11( + .091)] | | [B11-A11( + 4.2)] | |
| 12. AFDC Recipient | 20.4 | | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | [B12-A12(-.035)] | | [B12-A12( + 15.1)] | |
| 13. GA / RCA Recipient | 3.3 | | | [B13-A13(-.370)] | | [B13-A13(-.116)] | | [B13-A13(-.067)] | | //////////////////// | |
| 14. % Terminees | 75.9 | | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | [B14-A14(-18.5)] | |
| 15. Unemployment Rate | 7.4 | | | [B15-B15(-1.333)] | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | |
| 16. Population Density | .7 | | | //////////////////// | | [B16-A16( + 1.353)] | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | |
| 17. Emp. Res / Ratio | 99.9 | | | //////////////////// | | [B17-A17(-.051)] | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | |
| 18. Avg. Earnings - W/R | 12.5 | | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | //////////////////// | | [B18-A18( + 64.3)] | |
| | | | | NET EFFECT _____ | | NET EFFECT _____ | | NET EFFECT _____ | | NET EFFECT _____ | |

**Summary Section**

| Performance Standard | Calculated Standard | Actual Performance | % of Standard |
|---|---|---|---|
| Entered Employment Rate | "D" Net Effect = + 45.0 = | | |
| Positive Termination Rate | "E" Net Effect = + 75.0 = | | |
| Employability Enhancement Rate | "D" Net Effect = + 30.0 = | | |
| Cost per Positive Termination | "F" Net Effect = + $4900 = | | |

Worksheet 15

| MODEL ADJUSTED WORKSHEET FOR ANALYZING CLIENT CHARACTERISTIC PERFORMANCE<br>ADULT POST PROGRAM - PY 88 | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variables | National | Actual | Percent | Standards Calculations | | | | | |
| | A. | B. | C. | D. | | E. | | F. | |
| Adult | | | [B/A] | F/U. Emp. Rate | | F/U Weeks Work. | | F/U Wkly Earn | |
| 1. Female | 55.1 | | | //////////////////////// | | //////////////////////// | | [B1-A1(-.511)] | |
| 2. Age 30 + | 52.8 | | | [B2-A2(-.112)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B2-A2(.488)] | |
| 3. Black | 23.2 | | | [B3-A3(-.130)] | | [B3-A3(-.015)] | | [B3-A3(-.081)] | |
| 4. Dropout | 24.8 | | | [B4-A4(-.122)] | | [B4-A4(-.013)] | | [B4-A4(-.360)] | |
| 5. UC Claimant | 10.3 | | | [B5-A5(.123)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B5-A5(1.516)] | |
| 6. Offender | 8.4 | | | [B6-A6(-.131)] | | //////////////////////// | | [B6-A6(-.361)] | |
| 7. Unempl. 15 + | 48.7 | | | [B7-A7(-.038)] | | [B7-A7(-.016)] | | [B7-A7(-.097)] | |
| 8. Not in Labor F | 11.9 | | | [B8-A8(-.049)] | | //////////////////////// | | //////////////////////// | |
| 9. AFDC | 23.8 | | | [B9-A9(-.109)] | | [B9-A9(-.014)] | | //////////////////////// | |
| 10. GA/RCA | 5.2 | | | [B10-A10(-.165)] | | [B10-A10(-.023)] | | //////////////////////// | |
| 11. Unemp. Rate | 7.4 | | | [B11-A11(-.860)] | | [B11-A11(-.060)] | | [B11-A11(-1.167) | |
| 12. Avg. Earn R/W | 12.5 | | | //////////////////////// | | //////////////////////// | | [B12-A12(2.867) | |
| 13. Pop. Density | 0.7 | | | //////////////////////// | | //////////////////////// | | [B13-A13(2.248) | |
| 14. Fam. Bel. Pov. | 9.7 | | | //////////////////////// | | //////////////////////// | | [B14-A14(-.762)] | |
| 15. Emp. Res Ratio | 99.9 | | | //////////////////////// | | //////////////////////// | | [B15-A15(-.222) | |
| | | | | NET EFFECT ___ | | NET EFFECT ___ | | NET EFFECT ___ | |

Summary Section

| Performance Standard | Calculated Standard | Actual Performance | % of Standard |
|---|---|---|---|
| Follow-Up Employment Rate | "D" Net Effect = + 60.0 = | | |
| Follow-Up Weeks Worked | "E" Net Effect = + 8.0 = | | |
| Follow-Up Weekly Earnings | "F" Net Effect = +$177 = | | |
| F/U Welfare Employment Rate | "D" Net Effect = + 60.0 (x)* = | | |

* (x) = Public Assistance Employment Ratio ( Method II )





61

Worksheet 16

**MODEL ADJUSTED WORKSHEET FOR ANALYZING CLIENT CHARACTERISTIC PERFORMANCE**
**ADULT WELFARE - PY 88**

| Variables | National | Actual | Percent | Standards Calculations | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | A. | B. | C. | D. | | E. | |
| All Adult Welfare | | | [B/A] | Ent. Emp. Rate | | F/U Emp. Rate. | |
| 1. Black | 32.6 | | | [B1-A1(-.046)] | | [B1-A1(-.126)] | |
| 2. Dropout | 29.9 | | | [B2-A2(-.155)] | | [B2-A2(-.211)] | |
| 3. Unemployed 15 + weeks | 54.8 | | | [B3-A3(-.068)] | | [B3-A3(-.026)] | |
| 4. Not in Labor Force | 19.0 | | | [B4-A4(-.151)] | | [B4-A4(-.085)] | |
| 5. GA/RCA | 13.9 | | | [B5-A5(-.139)] | | [B5-A5(-.089)] | |
| 6. Unemployment Rate | 7.4 | | | [B6-A6(-.721)] | | [B6-A6(-.928)] | |
| | | | | NET EFFECT ___ | | NET EFFECT ___ | |

Summary Section

| Performance Standard | Calculated Standard | Actual Performance | % of Standard |
|---|---|---|---|
| Entered Employment Rate | "D" Net Effect = + 56.0 = | | |
| Follow-Up Employment Rate | "E" Net Effect = + 50.0 = | | |

## Section IV: Conclusion

The Job Training Partnership Act emphasizes the importance of program performance and outcomes. The law establishes specific criteria by which an SDA will be measured and provides for the award of incentives for local programs that perform exceptionally well. The purpose is to ensure that SDAs concentrate on results rather than on regulatory and compliance issues.

Performance standards are not "the" solution to effective JTPA planning and management but rather one of several tools available to administrators to improve performance. The challenge to local policy makers is to use performance standards to guide the development of programs which will meet the needs of the eligible population and business community.

In order to work effectively with performance standards, an SDA must have a clear vision of its role in the community. The key policy issues related to who is served and with what type of programs should be important building blocks in establishing the foundation for planning and management decisions. Since the performance standards model adjusts an SDA's standards primarily according to who is served and the program design, the degree of difficulty in meeting the standards will be the same, regardless of who is served and what is done for them. For local policy makers who fail to establish this foundation, performance standards can easily become a "numbers game," unrelated to the mission and purpose of JTPA in the community.

As JTPA matures, the performance standards system will continue to change. New measures will be added, standards will be modified, the adjustment methodology will be revised, and so on. However, the need to understand the dynamics of the performance standards system and its relationship to planning and management will remain constant. SDAs need to stay abreast of such changes and update and refine their planning and management practices as changes occur.

## National Alliance of Business Regional Service Offices

### New England

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont

Joseph Fischer, Regional Vice President
20 Walnut Street
Wellesley Hills, Massachusetts 02181
(617) 235-1332

### Atlantic

Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, Virginia, West Virginia

Fredrick Radlmann
Regional Vice President
317 George Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
(201) 524-4110

### Southeast

Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee

William 'Sonny' Walker
Regional Vice President
100 Edgewood Avenue, Suite 1800
Atlanta, Georgia 30303
(404) 522-9350

### Midwest

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, Wisconsin

### Midwest cont'd

Vincent Serritella
Regional Vice President
Eleven East Adams, Suite 1008
Chicago, Illinois 60603
(312) 341-9766

### Central

Arkansas, , Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas

Henry McHenry
Regional Vice President
9400 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75231
(214) 373-0854

### West

Arizona, California, Colorado, Guam, Hawaii, Nevada, Pacific Islands, Utah, Wyoming

Janet Keyes
Regional Vice President
350 Sansome St. Suite 1040
San Francisco, California 94104
(415) 391-4061

### Pacific Northwest

Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington

Rueben Flores, Regional Vice President
427 Skinner Building
Seattle, Washington, 98101
(206) 622-2531